



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/280,292	03/29/1999	NEIL ROSEMAN	120087.413	5547

25096 7590 12/06/2001

PERKINS COIE LLP  
PATENT-SEA  
P.O. BOX 1247  
SEATTLE, WA 98111-1247

EXAMINER

WEISBERGER, RICHARD C

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2164

DATE MAILED: 12/06/2001

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

82

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/280,292

Applicant(s)

ROSEMAN ET AL.

Examiner

Richard C. Weisberger

Art Unit

2164

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in-

(1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effect under this subsection of a national application published under section 122(b) only if the international application designating the United States was published under Article 21(2)(a) of such treaty in the English language; or  
(2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that a patent shall not be deemed filed in the United States for the purposes of this subsection based on the filing of an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a).

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

Claims 1-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over 5,960411.

The prior art teaches a method and system for single-action ordering of items in a client/server environment. According to the disclosure, the single-action ordering system of the present invention reduces the number of purchaser interactions needed to place an order and reduces the amount of sensitive information that is transmitted between a client system and a server system. Thus, the reference too, identifies the reduction of interaction time and/or steps and the amount of information transmitted as well known variables in the art of e-commerce. Moreover, the prior art shows in one embodiment, that the server system assigns a unique client identifier to each client system, and that

Art Unit: 2164

the server system stores purchaser-specific order information for various potential purchasers. In a preferred embodiment the prior art goes on to teach that the purchaser-specific order information may have been collected from a previous order placed by the purchaser. In addition, the prior art teaches that the server system maps each client identifier to a purchaser that may use that client system to place an order. In an alternate method, the server system may map the client identifiers to the purchaser who last placed an order using that client system. Moreover, when a purchaser wants to place an order, the prior art teaches that the purchaser uses a client system to send the request for information describing the item to be ordered along with its client identifier. Then, the server system determines whether the client identifier for that client system is mapped to a purchaser. If this is the case, the prior art method has the server system determining whether the single-action ordering is enabled for that purchaser at that client system. If enabled, the server system sends the requested information (e.g., via a Web page) to the client computer system along with an indication of the single action to perform to place the order for the item. When single-action ordering is enabled, the purchaser need only perform a single action (e.g., click a mouse button) to order the item. When the purchaser performs that single action, the client system notifies the server system. The server system then completes the order by adding the purchaser-specific order information for the purchaser that is mapped to that client identifier to the item order information. Thus, once the description of an item is displayed, the purchaser need only take a single action to place the order to purchase that item. Also, since the client identifier identifies purchaser-specific order information already stored

Art Unit: 2164

at the server system, the prior art teaches that there is no need for such sensitive information to be transmitted via the Internet or other communications medium.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over USP 5960411.

The prior art teaches a method and system for single-action ordering of items in a client/server environment. According to the disclosure, the single-action ordering system of the present invention reduces the number of purchaser interactions needed to place an order and reduces the amount of sensitive information that is transmitted between a client system and a server system. Thus, the reference too, identifies the reduction of interaction time and/or steps and the amount of information transmitted as well known variables in the art of e-commerce. Moreover, the prior art shows in one embodiment, that the server system assigns a unique client identifier to each client system, and that the server system stores purchaser-specific order information for various potential purchasers. In a preferred embodiment the prior art goes on to teach that the

Art Unit: 2164

purchaser-specific order information may have been collected from a previous order placed by the purchaser. In addition, the prior art teaches that the server system maps each client identifier to a purchaser that may use that client system to place an order. In an alternate method, the server system may map the client identifiers to the purchaser who last placed an order using that client system. Moreover, when a purchaser wants to place an order, the prior art teaches that the purchaser uses a client system to send the request for information describing the item to be ordered along with its client identifier. Then, the server system determines whether the client identifier for that client system is mapped to a purchaser. If this is the case, the prior art method has the server system determining whether the single-action ordering is enabled for that purchaser at that client system. If enabled, the server system sends the requested information (e.g., via a Web page) to the client computer system along with an indication of the single action to perform to place the order for the item. When single-action ordering is enabled, the purchaser need only perform a single action (e.g., click a mouse button) to order the item. When the purchaser performs that single action, the client system notifies the server system. The server system then completes the order by adding the purchaser-specific order information for the purchaser that is mapped to that client identifier to the item order information. Thus, once the description of an item is displayed, the purchaser need only take a single action to place the order to purchase that item. Also, since the client identifier identifies purchaser-specific order information already stored at the server system, the prior art teaches that there is no need for such sensitive information to be transmitted via the Internet or other communications medium.

Art Unit: 2164

The reference fails to teach of of the 1-click process applied to an auction process. It would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time to have applied the methods of the prior art to an auction process since the elimination of an element (authentication) or step from a known process if the function of the element or step is not desired. Here, internet auction systems were ubiquitous at the time of the filing of the invention. So too was the need to increase the speed of the auctioning process. Accordingly, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time to apply the 1-click technology of the prior art to internet auction methods. The reference also fails to teach the method wherein the filed of entry contains suggested bid amounts. It would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time to have included suggested bid amounts in the "field of entry" as motivated by the desire to increase the speed of the transaction.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications should be directed to Richard C Weisberger whose telephone number is 703 308 4408. If attempts are unsuccessful, the Vince Millin can be reached on 703 308 1065. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703 746 7239 for regular communications and 703 746 7239 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703 306 54631.

Application/Control Number: 09/280,292

Art Unit: 2164

Page 7

Richard C Weisberger  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 2164

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Rich Weisberger", written in black ink.

RCW

December 3, 2001